

Emerging Knowledge Societies in the EU and Japan

Reconfiguring Collaboration in the Social Sciences and Humanities

Alain-Marc Rieu

Professor, University Jean Moulin – Lyon 3

Senior Research Fellow, Institute of East-Asian Studies (CNRS)

Knowledge Society Network

Research project undertaken for
European Union – Delegation of the European Commission to Japan

July 2006

Emerging Knowledge Societies in the EU and Japan

Content

Summary	p 4
Building a common platform	p 7
1. Present coincidence, major opportunity	p 7
2. Similar diagnosis, similar response	p 7
3. The Third and the Seventh are the first	p 10
4. Globalization: increased complexity, increasing collaboration	p 12
5. A growing role for Human and Social Sciences	p 16
Restructuring collaboration	p 21
1. Bridge design	p 21
2. First level: themes from the platform	p 23
3. Second level: the structure of the Social Sciences and Humanities in the EU 7 th Framework Programme	p 26
4. Third level: Japan and Europe in search of each other	p 29
5. Institutional innovation for joint Research in Social and Human Sciences	p 35
Conclusion	p 41
Appendices	
- A proposal for joint research between the European and Japanese research programs	p 44
- EU and European Studies in Japan	p 46
- Alain-Marc Rieu: CV	p 50

Summary

Japan's 3rd Basic Plan for Science and Technology and the European Union's 7th Framework Programme for Science and Technology are both launched at a few months interval, in mid-2006 and early 2007. This coincidence opens the opportunity to imagine from the beginning of these large-scale policies innovative forms of pertinent collaboration.

Both the 7th European Framework Programme and Japan's 3rd Basic Plan include an increasing role for the Social Sciences and the Humanities, for the whole continent of Human and Social Sciences in general, beyond or around the role played by Economics.

This evolution is best expressed by the role played by an inter-discipline born in the 1970ies, the Science and Technology Studies. Indeed, the present Head of the European Research Advisory Board and member of the European Research Council, Helga Nowotny, comes from this field of Research. More generally, the increased role of the Social Sciences and the Humanities in the very fabric of the EU Research Policy introduces a debate about what is a "Knowledge Society". A similar situation is found in Japan, for instance at the National Institute of Science and Technology Policy (NISTEP).

Many ideas in this report develop a perspective similar to documents produced by the European Research Advisory Board concerning the Social Sciences and the Humanities and the "Science and Society" programme¹.

This conjuncture opens a major opportunity for a change of scale in the collaboration between Japanese and European institutions dedicated to Social Sciences and the Humanities. To show the necessity of such collaboration and to explore these opportunities are the goals of this report.

¹ For instance the conference *Social Sciences and the Humanities in Europe – New challenges, new opportunities* (Brussels, 12-13 December 2005, see *SSH Newsletter* n°1-2006, p 3-4).

In order to achieve these goals, this report intends to fulfil the basic function of Social and Human Sciences: to explain the context presiding over the formation of policies and the conditions for their successful implementation. Accordingly, this report will first explain the conjuncture in which the 7th European Framework Programme for Science and Technology and Japan's 3rd Basic Plan for Science and Technology were designed and to which they try to respond.

Because any context is a historical and social construction, this context changes according to the knowledge specialists in Social Sciences and the Humanities are able to produce and to share. The fact that both Japan and the European Union are increasing and widening the role of Human and Social Sciences in their present Research policies proves the maturing of these policies. Because these policies concern all aspects of life in society, because they condition the future of our economies, they learn how to take into account the complexity of the parameters presiding over their formation and successful implementation. But in return, now that these disciplines receive such a strong institutional recognition, they have to prove that they can evolve in order to fulfil their role and make a difference. Because these disciplines are deeply embedded in the history and culture of each Nation, the best way to achieve this goal is to develop strong multi-disciplinary collaboration. This is also true of Economics, even if it has the status of a global normative discipline. This evolution proves the emergence of Knowledge Societies in the EU and Japan. This is why collaboration between Europe and Japan is crucial.

Main objectives:

- A common basis
 - To explain the perspective common to the EU 7th Framework and Japan's 3rd Basic Plan.
 - Each policy is presented in relation to the other;
- A joint platform of innovative research
 - To formulate an argumentative platform between this two large-scale research policies within which Social and Human scientists in Japan and Europe can develop joint innovative projects;
- Common themes and problems
 - To identify the main axes and problems of common interest structuring research about the European Union in Japan and about Japan in the EU.
- Innovative research structures
 - To identify institutions in Japan best adapted to develop new joint research.

- To identify in the EU what structures of collaboration are needed to meet the expectations of the 7th Framework Programme.
- To show the need for *flexible networks* between established institutions and programmes in the EU and Japan.

This analysis and resulting proposals extend beyond increased collaboration between Japanese specialists of Europe and European specialists of Japan. These researchers play an essential role; they are well organized and have developed their own networks. But this report is designed for all those concerned by the emergence of various forms of Knowledge Societies. The goal is to give shape to a new research community beyond existing national borders and disciplinary limitations.

This is the reason why the goal is to create a bridge and a platform between European and Japanese specialists, beyond National and disciplinary divides. This platform identifies and articulates several common fields of Research and Development in Social and Human Sciences.

On purpose, this report is not filled with figures and comparative budgets². The reason is the meaning of this report: what in the end makes the difference in the performance of Research Policies is not the amount of money spent but the institutional system in which such policies are imagined, negotiated, designed, implemented and evaluated. The social fabric makes the difference.

Access to information and documents:

- On Japan 3rd Basic Plan: <http://www.anstep.net/country/japan.htm> and NISTEP website: www.nistep.go.jp/
- On the EU 7th Framework Programme for Science and Technology: see http://ec.europa.eu/research/fp7/home_en.html. The key document is the *Draft research agenda for Theme 8 “Socio-economic Sciences and the Humanities” in the 7th Community RTD Framework Programme (2007-2013)*.

² All the information is easily available at the above websites.

Building a common conceptual platform

1. Present coincidence, major opportunity

This is a remarkable coincidence: the European Union 7th Framework for Science and Technology and Japan's Third Basic Plan for Science and Technology will both be launched in 2006 and early 2007, within a few months interval. Both projects have obviously been developed on very different bases. Both are the result of long and complex internal negotiations. Of course, in the European Union, the construction of such a programme is made much more complex by the need to associate various research traditions and cultures in Science and Technology, various levels of development also. Furthermore, Science and Technology policies have been in the 20th century a major component of the Nation-State identity: they have been associated with autonomy and power, National security and prestige. This explains why the formation of Research policies at the level of the Union has been and still is a difficult process: these difficulties are not a sign of weakness but of strength, a measure of the problems, which have to be solved.

On a smaller scale but with comparable complexity, Japan also faced many challenges to conceive and develop since the mid-1990s its Basic Plans for Science and Technology. They are the consequence of major reforms of several ambitious research policies launched since the late 1970ies. The Basic Plans are the result of difficult negotiations between competing Ministries, between Government, Ministries and academic communities, between the public and the private sectors. Still, beyond this asymmetry of scale and complexity, Research policies in the EU and Japan share many features.

2. Similar diagnosis, similar response

Beyond these differences, the EU, each European Nation, and Japan share the same diagnosis of the present world conjuncture, a similar response to the Globalization process and its main line of evolution.

In the 1990s, it became increasingly clear that the long-term future of each advanced industrial societies was to be found in their capacity to generate new knowledge and to translate this advance in knowledge into new companies and new products. In this context, the competition in Science and Technology between all OECD nations intensified. This new wave of industrial and political competition stimulated all activities related to the production and transfer of knowledge. The main actors of this change were not, are not managers or politicians; they are scientists, researchers, engineers, even post-doctoral students, and also specialists of recent disciplines like science studies and management of technology. Research policies found a new meaning and a new urgency. Until then, these actors were before deeply embedded in social and political systems. Now their interests and values, the logic of their activities, become more and more openly asserted. Those in charge of the economy and social policies, of politics and international relations, slowly recognize them as major actors. This is a major shift in the power structure of industrial societies. Many reforms of research institutions, universities, national systems of innovation, etc, have been developed during the last fifteen years. New reforms are still debated, now openly supported by EU agencies. A whole new sector of activity is taking shape: its importance is being recognized and it learns how to change its relations to society, to politics and to the economic system. All these issues, debates and policies generate the emergence of a “Knowledge Society”. The emergence, conception and study of a Knowledge Society is what is at stake in both the EU 7th Framework and in Japan’s 3rd Basic Plan.

At the same time, a new understanding was taking shape in the EU. It became clearer and clearer for governments, scientists and Brussels administrators that competition in Science and Technology would become counterproductive if it was not counterbalanced and regulated by increased collaboration at the level of the Union. This mutation of rivalry into cooperation, this new conception and management of competition were the basic assumption at the origin of Europe’s unification process in the 1950ies. Now, in the 1990s and early 21st century, it became clear in Europe that negative rivalry in Science and Technology had to mutate into positive competition through increased collaboration. For all these reasons, Research and Development played a growing role in the unification process. It gave birth to joint policies at the level of the Union, associating each member-State in an open and competitive response to joint Research programmes. In this context, it was clear to each European government that Research policies had been and still were a major component of the sovereignty of each State. But, one after the other, member States admitted that their future required active participation to a common

Research Policy. This is a decisive step in Europe's unification, exceeding the present problems of its edification. It also has major consequences for international relations.

Japan was in a similar situation since the 1980s. Science and Technology have always been a major concern for Japan since its opening and modernization in the second half of the 19th century. This concern grew even stronger during the 1990s and until today. During the fifteen years long "lost decade", Japan was on its own through a major crisis, a lone nation hooked on the Asian continent engaged in a historical mutation, with China becoming a major competitor and partner. But Japan's crisis also opened in the late 1990s the possibility of a deep mutation. This mutation had been debated even before the crisis. The crisis was reinforcing amongst Japanese leaders their diagnosis of the situation, strengthening their will to initiate an immense mutation and to find the means to finance it.

In summary, the diagnosis was the following: in the 1980s, the Japanese economy grew fast and became powerful because it was riding the last "technological wave" of the time, Information and Communication Technology. However this technology was not born in Japan but in the US, even though quickly imported and assimilated by the Japanese industrial system with major technological innovations and new products. Japan then exported these innovative products all over the world. The competition with the US intensified during the 1980s. The US response finally hit the core of Japan's competitive edge: the exchange rate of the Yen. The rise of the Yen (*endaka*) in 1985 and its consequences transformed the long-term basis of the Japanese economy.

Japanese leaders in political, business and academic circles reached a consensus. This consensus lasts until today: Japan was to create in the future the basis of its long-term social and economic development. This basis had to be found in Science and Technology. Japan had to reach this goal on its own but also through strong international cooperation. Since the 1980s, the main Ministries, mostly the MITI, had put in place large-scale Research programmes. In the crisis of the 1990s and in order to overcome this crisis, these programmes were fully reorganized and further developed. At the same time, the institutional environment of these programmes was deeply reformed: ministries, universities, National institutes, government structure and behaviour, the interactions between the public and private sectors were debated and eventually reformed. A Ministry of Education, Culture, Sport, Science and Technology was organized in order to take the lead in Science and Technology. All these reforms were difficult to achieve but they were needed in order to generate the long-term ground of Japan's social and economic development. These are the logic and goals of the first two Basic Plan for Science and Technology, from 1996 to 2001 and from 2001 to 2006.

These diagnoses and responses, their presuppositions about society, international relations, Globalization, etc, the processes needed to construct and implement policies, to anticipate and manage their consequences for the populations concerned, all these parameters have opened a growing interest and role for Human and Social Sciences. This new role extends beyond Economic disciplines. In order to fulfil the role Human and Social Sciences have to play today, the possibility to develop joint research associating Japanese and European specialists would certainly be a major progress. Japanese specialists of European Science and Technology policies are already at work in an institution like the NISTEP in Tokyo. Such specialists also exist in Europe. The time has come to create a platform to discuss and develop joint research projects.

3. The Third and the Seventh are the first

Major reforms of “National Research Systems” have been implemented in Japan and in each European Nation. They need to be compared and evaluated. University reform today is one of the main impulses of the EU. Concerning Science and Technology in Europe, a significant reform has been achieved at the level of the EU. This reform is the creation of an agency, the *European Research Council*, established as independent from the political influence by member-States. The independence of an agency in charge of managing EU science and technology is a key progress toward the emergence of a European Knowledge Society. This advancement means that the role of research in Europe’s future, the requirements and values of the research communities participating in these projects, have now been fully recognized. In consequence, for the EU, the new Framework Programme for Science and Technology might be the seventh but in many ways it is the first: it breaks new grounds by its scope but also by the organization developed to manage it as well as by the recognition of the role Human and Social Sciences have from now on to play in the conception and implementation of research policies.

A similar evolution can be observed in Japan. The Third Basic Plan for Science and Technology is also in many ways the first. Its main goal is to operate a “quantum leap in knowledge, discovery and creation – accumulation and creation of diverse knowledge to ensure a bright future – (1) Discover and clarify new principles and phenomenon, (2) Create knowledge as a basis of discontinuous technical innovation”³. It is a quantum leap considering the first two plans, which were mostly dedicated to the modernization of research infrastructure,

³ *Science and Technology Basic Plan* - provisional translation -, Government of Japan, March 28, 2006, Chapter 1.

to the reform of the structure and organization of research at the national and local level, to the intensification of international cooperation. The decisive step made by the Third Basic Plan launched in 2006 is not expressed by its increased budget. It is best expressed by the scope, ambition and, foremost, the methodology implemented to build the plan, by the association of a large number of actors from various disciplines and different sectors. This Third Plan is a remarkable achievement because it is in effect a mirror of the state of Japan and of its view of its future.

Both the EU 7th plan and Japan's 3rd introduce a qualitative change in the emergence of a Knowledge Society. The coincidence between these two long-term and large-scale research policies has also as a consequence a qualitative change in the level and the mode of cooperation in Human and Social Sciences between the EU and Japan. Further in this report, detailed proposals will be made in order to create the bases of new collaboration. This concerns ethics, politics, economics, institutional reforms and also the understanding and management of such policies. Japan's Plan does not specifically mention the Social Sciences and the Humanities but it mentions the many social and human issues, which are the objects and goals of these disciplines.

Chapter 3 is quite interesting from this point of view. This chapter might not be taken seriously outside Japan, maybe not read at all. What is expressed in chapter 3 is the will to reform Japan's Science and Technology System in order to further integrate and associate the Japanese population within these policies. At this level, a top-down approach would fail and Japan cannot afford to take the risk of failure. Of course "human resources" remains the key word. Still the population is not anymore reduced to Consuming, Commuting, Learning, Lodging and Reproducing. The texture of everyday life is taken into account: health, family life, education and training, sexual disparities, urban planning, leisure and transport, etc. All these aspects of individual and collective lives are a clear incentive for an open range of new products and technological innovation.

The real issue for Japan's R&D policy is to make sense to people, to be adopted and assimilated by the population. The reference to "human wisdom" is not cynical, it is an attempt to design a Japanese "Knowledge Society" based on a R&D policy asserting some degree of autonomy from uncontrollable competition with the US, the EU, China, India, etc. Since the 1990s, Japan has been looking for a different type of social and economic development, for a different social and economic system. Japan sees its future in a fusion of Humanity, Technology and the Environment. Progress in Knowledge is seen as an advancement of all sectors of society. This is why Japan is probably the most progressive case of a Knowledge Society in the

world. This does not mean at all that Japanese Science and Technology are the first! They are not the first and not the best but it might not even be their objective anymore. The Japanese elite has been looking for a development trajectory alternative to US and European, Chinese or Indian conception of technology and power. My opinion is simple: let's take these Japanese ideas seriously in order to learn and profit from them. The best way to learn and profit is to collaborate.

All these issues constitute an open field of Research and Development for all disciplines, hard and soft. This conjuncture induces disciplines to imagine and implement new collaboration with each other. Associating researchers from all over Europe with their Japanese counterparts is the only way to progress in this direction. This is not the direction taken by the US. The problem therefore is to understand and debate where European and Japanese Research Policies are leading us.

4. Globalization: increased complexity, increasing collaboration

Consequence of different evolutions, born from different (but related) histories, Japan and the European Nations have entered the same historical process, the transformation of their society and economy into "Knowledge Societies". The scale differs, a Nation versus an association of Nations, but the perception of the present and of the future is very similar. The hopes, anticipations and, eventually, illusions, might also be similar. This is the reason why the present coincidence needs to be thoroughly investigated and debated. From this point of view, Europe's unification is quite a meaningful experience for the Japanese who have come to admit that their future resides in a growing convergence of East-Asian economies, societies and even policies. The problem of such a convergence is that nations also search ways of sustaining their differences and identities. But this motivation to sustain diversity is not detrimental to a convergence or even a unification process. It is on the contrary necessary to sustain the flexibility and adaptability of such an "association", "partnership" or "federation". This is also a great challenge for the EU. For the Japan, the European Union has been and still is a major laboratory for institutional innovation. Anyone can learn from it but in return the Union needs to learn from other "post-national" experiences. If they would understand better what is at stake in the EU, the Japanese people would understand that they are not forced to chose "either or", either China or the USA, either Asia or the West, etc. Extended and intensified collaboration opens new perspectives and opportunities for all partners. This is one of the major issues of the Globalization process.

Because of their separate histories, similarities between present Japanese and EU policies cannot conceal that these trajectories lead to different ways of responding to global challenges. Other Nations share this diagnosis and search for ways to respond to it, to invent their own “knowledge society”. This new “grand transformation” is taking place in other parts of the world, in the USA of all places but also in Canada, China, India, Brazil, Singapore, Russia, Israel or South Africa. The true challenge is: how can anyone expect to profit from a “competitive advantage” if others are following the same path with the goal to *catch up* as fast as possible in order to lead in a given field? What are the consequences for social systems of this race? Is this “race to the bottom” the only solution? Industrial nations are engaged in a “mimetic” competition: all of them try to invest in Research and Development in order to be part of a process, which is supposed to transform the world and eventually, in the end, solve all problems.

This competition has become so intense that it hides the real issues. The constraints are piling up: growing energy shortages, environmental issues and global warming, demographic disparities and pandemics, increasing competition between nations and regions, inequities and intensified religious fundamentalism, etc. These constraints aggregate to the point that the evolution becomes unpredictable and unmanageable. “Knowledge Society” is not a formula for a cure: it is an epistemic conjuncture combined with a methodology to identify common problems and search for joint solutions. Debates, intense and open collaboration, research in science and technology as well as in social sciences and the Humanities are the ground of a methodology still to be invented. European Nations and Japan should take the lead in this debate for at least two reasons: they are not in a situation of hegemony; they are free from the need to *catch up*.

These issues and reforms, anticipations and illusions have a special meaning for European Nations, mainly for the EU founding nations, the so-called “core members”, those nations which competed with each other, fought each other until disaster and exhaustion in 1945. These nations went through a historical process identified as “Modernization”. The modernization process broke apart their society and thoroughly transformed their economy. This transformation is inseparable from the invention and development of Modern Science and Technology. Japan is the Nation in the East, on the other side of the world, which in the second half of the 19th century decided to “Leave the East, join the West”, to “modernize” by assimilating and implementing Western Science and Technology in order to organize a strong State, to produce steel and an army, to educate and train people, to create and manage companies, to finance this development, to control the impact on the population. It also made

war to its neighbours. For all these reasons, it is impossible not to hear in these large-scale research policies, “Basic Plan” and “Framework Programme”, the spirit or the hope of a new Modernization, of a reopening of historical trajectories. In order to be fully understood, these policies need therefore to be studied and debated within a joint platform associating Europeans and Japanese specialists. This joint knowledge is nowadays a prerequisite for a fruitful collaboration. But Modernization is a *virus*: it spread all over the world and mutated each society it invaded. Collaboration between Japan and the EU cannot exclude the rest of the world. This conceptual platform should therefore associate research communities and cultures outside Europe and Japan. The risk is not to lose information to competitors; the risk is not to profit from diversity of competence.

Both research policies are increasing the participation of foreign specialists and foreign institutions. It is a necessary step but this change adds a new level of complexity. Is it possible to evaluate the performance of Japan’s Third Basic Plan without taking into account how and why China and India are increasing investment in Research and Development? How Singapore became a powerbase in biotechnology? How the USA took the lead in Science and Technology since 1945? What is the impact of institutional reforms on the performance of a Research policy? All these broad and intricate questions are in the back of the mind of managers, researchers and politicians. Building and managing research policies has become a highly complex task. US policies and their institutional environment, US universities and the impact of the US Industrial Property strategy, the Small Business Act, US military dominance, etc, have shaped how the Europeans, the Japanese and others have profiled and organized their research policies until now. All policies and strategies compete and interact with each other. Each one is a response to another one. They are all different but they are also all intertwined. This is the reason why we experience today the emergence of different forms of “Knowledge Society”. These various “Knowledge Societies” will very soon compete with each other. Yet we still don’t know what is a “Knowledge Society”, what could be or should be a European or Japanese “Knowledge Society”?

The construction of the European Union is an experience in managing diversity. Various forms of Knowledge Society are also competing with each other within the EU itself. Still the historical meaning of the European Union is its project and capacity to transform negative competition into positive collaboration through negotiation. The Europeans learned

how to create institutions by “hybridization and harmonization”⁴ and to imagine and implement joint programmes. The 7th Framework Programme for Science and Technology is one of the finest achievements of this European competence. This experience and competence need to be adapted to the global challenge of emerging Knowledge Societies competing with each other without clear benefits for all of them. “Mankind”, the “benefits for mankind” are a constant reference in Japan’s 3rd Basic Plan. This is more than cynical rhetoric; it is the asserted need to make sense of present Science and Technology, to give a global purpose and an historical ambition to Research policies. Empowering Europe or the EU, politically and economically, seems the main purpose of the 7th Framework. “Growth, employment and competitiveness” is certainly a pragmatic and highly beneficial goal for a federation of Nations. But one can question if it is the best ambition for a “European model”.

Therefore designing joint-programmes with Japan would be a fruitful evolution of the EU Science and Technology policies. The problem is not to draw the list of one’s own priorities (EU websites provide an ample list of “priorities”, “main objectives” and “road maps”) and then to see who would like to collaborate. We will soon reach a point when priorities will have to be negotiated collectively, by “hybridization and harmonization”. For the reasons above mentioned, for sustaining diversity and expending opportunities, the best option for Europe and Japan is to start with each other. It frees them from the spectre of rivalry and its related fears: rivalry with the US, fear of China or India “catching up”, etc. Let’s not be naïve: increasing collaboration is not renouncing competition, the search of National or regional advantage. The goal is to achieve positive competition through collaboration. This is the meaning of the EU experience. Sharing lists of priorities is not the best option: these lists are the same everywhere:

- Health
- Biotechnology and agriculture
- Information and Communication Technology
- Nano-sciences and technologies
- New industrial technologies
- Energy
- Environment and climate change,
- Transport and urban planning,
- Space,

⁴ Mireille Delmas-Marty, *Les forces imaginantes du droit*; vol. 2: *Le pluralisme ordonné*, Paris, Le seuil 2006, 1^{ère} partie.

- Security,
- At the bottom: Social and economic sciences and the Humanities.

Figures in Yen, Dollars and Euros can be added after each item on the list. The similarity of these lists even increases competition instead of strengthening collaboration. But the main issue today is to generate new knowledge, then to transfer and translate this knowledge throughout society. This is globally called “innovation”. But the innovation process cannot be reduced to the amount of Yen or Euros invested. In the end, the difference lies in the capacity of each society to imagine new products and build new industries, create new jobs and different life styles, social benefits and better health, freedom and security. The difference is not found in a list of priorities and a budget, not even in the amount of scientists and engineers trained per year. The difference resides in the institutional environment in which knowledge is produced and percolates. This difference is studied by the disciplines coming last on the list: Human and Social Sciences. The knowledge these disciplines generate and share transforms the context in which knowledge is produced and distributed, managed and developed. In this context, budgets indeed make sense.

To manage research and development, it is normal to make lists of priorities and to invite foreign specialists to participate. But today, at the age of globalization, because of the constraints on all societies, there is another option: to build bridges and common platforms of Research and Development. The present duty of Social Sciences and the Humanities is to create and manage these bridges and common platforms.

5. The growing role of Human and Social Sciences

Both Japan’s 3rd Basic Plan and the EU 7th Framework Programme have for a goal the emergence and promotion of a “Knowledge Society”. A Knowledge Society is obviously a programme for the emergence of a new era in the evolution of advanced Industrial Societies. This new era is supposed to be based on major advances in Science and Technology since the 1980s or even since the late 19th century. This comment shows how undetermined for the moment the idea of a “Knowledge Society” is. It often sounds like a marketing slogan for the promotion of Science and Technology, for allocating always more funds to research and engineering in a competition for hegemony. It is a fact: the script of this programme is not written yet; it is still to be investigated and debated. Who is going to write the script? Which disciplines are able to write it? It is the specialists in the Social Sciences and the Humanities who will write the script. The scientific community will certainly actively participate. Indeed

what is at stake for scientists and engineers is their role in society, their autonomy and responsibility in an age when Research is organized and managed by Research Policies. The population also will have to be associated in writing the script. How to do this effectively, how to organize a democratic debate for the emergence of a Knowledge Society, is still a problem to be solved. Human and Social Sciences have a role to play because they investigate the changing role and organization of knowledge in our societies.

As mentioned before, Globalization makes things even more complex. The project of a Knowledge Society is already the object of intense competition in the world, mainly between the USA, Japan and the EU, but also with India, China or Russia. It is impossible or vain to design research policies here and ignore similar policies in other parts of the world. Because they know how to contextualize issues and policies, Human and Social Sciences have the potential to explain and regulate this situation by studying and debating the conception and role of Knowledge today.

This is the reason it is important to situate both Japan's 3rd Basic Plan and the EU's 7th Framework programme in a common perspective, to build a conceptual platform capable of describing both of them in the same pattern. The benefit of such an approach is to explain why a Knowledge Society cannot be reduced to Science, Technology and Engineering, plus their economic consequences and impact. All the issues presented above show the relevance of historical, cultural, political and social as well as economic factors. All these issues belong to the fields investigated by the Social Sciences and the Humanities. Therefore a Knowledge Society is not a Scientific and Technological Society. It is not another name for a Knowledge Economy. A Knowledge Society is what joint research and common debates will make out of it, how our societies make sense of research in order to solve their problems, how they design their future in the way they understand and practice Research and Development. This is what needs to be investigated and debated by European and Japanese specialists, with no exclusion but within well-structured joint research programmes.

When Science and Technology policies take such pre-eminence in society, when it transforms the way we live, work and communicate, when it changes our conception of life and our relation to the environment, it becomes clear that social, cultural, political and economic problems become more and more intertwined and relevant for the progress of knowledge. When Science and Technology are conceived as shaping the future of whole societies and their relations to each other, these issues cannot be considered as being *outside* science and technology, they operate *inside* their evolution, inside the life of laboratories, inside scientific and political institutions. They also play a growing role inside the conception and

implementation of Research policies. This is the mutation introduced by Japan's 3rd and the EU 7th. These problems are not obstacles to be overcome, a resistance to be vanquished: they express the texture of society, what shapes Research and what opens Development. They do not sit at the bottom of a list of priorities because they are the least important. They are inside each item on the list. This is why the 3rd and the 7th are in fact the 1st. This is the paradox we all have in common today: the more Science and Technology play an important role in our societies, the more scientific and technological development needs for these factors to be taken into account and the more Science and Technology need to be understood and managed as a social, cultural, economic and political process. The more Social and Human Sciences become essential to their understanding.

Also the more it becomes evident that our societies do not have the Human and Social Sciences they would need in order to analyze and organize, to take decision and manage Research and Development. This is the reason why the institutional support given to these "soft" disciplines in these Framework Programmes is so important. To formulate the following questions is to show the absence of proper answers: what would be a "European" Knowledge Society? What would be properly "European" or "Japanese" in a Knowledge Society? How could European nations negotiate a common model for Science and Technology and their relations to society, to the environment? What kind of society is being imagined, nurtured in these European and Japanese programmes?

Developing a perspective encompassing both the EU 7th Framework and Japan's 3rd Basic Plan would prove the relevance of potential projects in Human and Social Sciences, which need to be developed between European and Japanese specialists. The recognition of the role and meaning of the Social Sciences and the Humanities is a major achievement for both Research policies. But now comes the difficult task: what to do and how to organize such programmes? How can Human and Social Sciences innovate in order to fulfil their anticipated task? To achieve the first step toward this goal, Human and Social Sciences need to question their presuppositions, to reconfigure the demarcations of their fields of study and methodologies. Studying Japan and collaborating with Japanese specialists is the best way for Europeans to succeed. The same can be said for Japan.

To build common concepts is a requirement for the invention of a "Knowledge Society". Such collaborative projects should be a priority. The first task should be to evaluate the conception of Human and Social Sciences promoted by the EU 7th Framework and Japan's 3rd Basic Plan. When research policies of such magnitude include a definition of a domain and of its disciplines, the conceptions behind these definitions massively structure the domain

concerned, its disciplines and their relations. For the moment, the conception of Human and Social Sciences in the 7th EU Framework is not even clearly established: “Social Sciences and the Humanities”, “Social and Economic Sciences and the Humanities”, “Socio-economic Sciences and the Humanities”, etc. These denominations suppose a “divide” between the Social Sciences on one side and the Humanities on the other. This divide reproduces the divide between the “two cultures”, between a scientific culture and a literary culture. Paradoxically, one obvious objective of the present EU policy is to overcome this divide. To introduce or reproduce a divide between the Humanities and the Social Sciences implies that the Humanities deal with values and narratives, faith and ethics, the meaning of individual and collective life, with culture. It implies that the Social Sciences are based on facts, data, explanation, rational decision and foresight. According to this divide, the Social Sciences are Social Technologies and they are worth financing because they are “scientific” and because they solve “real” problems: management, innovation, growth, employment, crime, security, etc. This is a very dangerous conception of “science”. But it is even more dangerous to assume that the true foundation of a society, what gives sense to its evolution and meaning to its people, is beyond Reason and Science, that this ground is irrational, that it cannot be discussed, investigated and rationally shared with others. The divide embedded in the notion of “Social Sciences and the Humanities” should be urgently debated and eventually corrected.

This is what this report tries to achieve. Only by overcoming this divide will it become possible for Human and Social Sciences to clarify their presuppositions, to question their demarcation and take into account the problems raised by the transformation of the role and organization of Knowledge in our societies, by the emergence of so called “Knowledge Societies”. Three major changes transformed the Social Sciences and the Humanities since the 1970ies:

- The formation within the Social Sciences of a field of research alternatively called Social Studies of Science, Science and Technology Studies, Social Epistemology or Science-Technology-Society. This field is the inspiration of this report. But this field still lacks clear concepts and methodology, a common definition of its objects and evaluation of its presuppositions
- Another important achievement is the formation (mainly in U.K. and also in Japan, in France and in the US) of highly influential schools of thought studying the Management of Science and Technology (MOT).
- Ethics is another field of research. Behind the clash of values and the need for legal regulations, many debates remain confusing and inefficient. Ethics certainly raises

problems but it needs still to prove that it can provide clear descriptions and proper solutions to the many questions raised by recent advance in Science and Technology.

Intense international collaboration is needed to reform the Social and Human Sciences in order to make sense of this project of a Knowledge Society. A solution is to take the opportunity of the 3rd Basic Plan and the 7th FP to restructure collaboration between European and Japanese specialists on themes of common interest and concern.

**Restructuring collaboration
in the Social Sciences and the Humanities
between the EU and Japan**

Let's face the following fact: what can truly motivate Japanese and European researchers to collaborate with each other, beyond the pleasure of spending time in each other countries? It is to produce knowledge they would not have been able to produce separately. Without this incentive, everybody prefers to collaborate with US universities where at least one is sure to find the best Japanese and Europeans in all fields.

Still what can interest both Japan and Europe is the construction of a model for Science and Technology alternative to the US present hegemony in science and technology. This is the untold goal of both Japanese and European large-scale Research Policies. What can make the difference? What makes the model? What makes the difference is not found in a list of scientific and technological "priorities". The difference lies in the institutional environment, in this environment studied by Human and Social Sciences, managed according to their findings. These disciplines are always found at the bottom of any list of priorities. But in fact, to develop collaboration within the EU and with Japan, they should not come first but should be considered as a general introduction or prerequisite.

1. Bridge design

Reports on collaboration between Nations or Regions reach a crucial moment when they finally face differences of interest and orientation. Comes then the task to "harmonize and hybridize". The method and objective are a contribution to this task. Because of the context of their construction, Japanese and EU policies cannot be congruent. The goal of a conceptual platform is to create a bridge in Human and Social Sciences between the Japan 3rd Basic Plan and the EU 7th Framework Programme. The EU Basic Plan has a clear objective: "to build an effective and democratic European Knowledge Society" (<http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/faq.htm#1>).

This is the exact goal of the Japanese Plan. Therefore my objective is to show and to prove that the platform constructed in the first part of this report is also a bridge.

Building a bridge is just an image but a very telling one. Both plans are a project to cross the river of scientific and technological advancement as well as the turbulence of globalization. These constructions are steps towards the future; they try to create grounds in order to advance on an unknown territory on which they hope to rebuild their society and economy. For the moment, these bridges go nowhere because there is no pre-existing goal and no clear direction. I support the idea that these two bridges should meet, because, at their intersection, something new can be imagined and built. Once the two bridges are connected, they can be transformed into a common platform. This platform has the capacity to associate in joint projects the two sides of the bridge, in projects imagined or undertaken by one side of the bridge but projects in need of another side in order to progress and innovate.

This is just an image. For the moment, the only requirement is that a group of specialists, coming from all disciplines (including science and engineering) and different institutions in Japan and the EU, start discussing and evaluating the narrative, debate its presuppositions and propositions in order to rewrite it into a common platform. Then several joint research projects could be written.

The meaning of the present proposal is that these Basic Plans open the possibility to go one step further than constructing policies in one's own corner of the world and relate to the policies of others on the sole ground of competition. However difficult the construction of such policies, it is necessary to establish innovative common programmes beyond the boundaries of economic interests and cultural preconceptions. This is particularly relevant and efficient for Human and Social Sciences because these disciplines explain the differences in the construction and implementation of such policies. They build bridges on differences. The problem is not to design one's own policy and then politely invite and associate foreigners. European Studies in Japan and Japanese Studies in the EU are well established: to study each other helps but it is not enough. The problem is to imagine and create something together, which could not have been achieved without the other. This is not an idealistic or fuzzy approach, typical of the Humanities. This is necessary for the advancement and reform of the Human and Social Sciences at the age of a "Knowledge Society".

I identify three levels of potential collaboration between the EU and Japan. I will not quote or summarize them. I present them from the point of view of the bridge, of their convergence, intersection and overlapping, starting by a synthesis of the themes identified by

the common platform. This open approach is designed as a toolbox for researchers reading this report, efficient and easy to use.

Plan:

- First level: themes from the platform
- Second level: the structure of the Social Sciences and Humanities in the EU
7th Framework Programme for Science and Technology
- Third level: Japan and Europe in search of each other

2. First level: themes from the platform

The common platform identifies and articulates four fields (plus one) of Research and Development in Social and Human Sciences. As explained, this platform is neither a EU nor a Japanese platform. It is a platform in between EU and Japanese Research, common to various teams or groups of European and Japanese specialists. Its only goal is to efficiently generate new knowledge. It is articulated around five broad themes opening a wide array of collaborative research. These themes are a frame for the puzzle of open research; they make sense of the different pieces freely developed by researchers.

For these reasons, they should be opened to specialists outside the EU and Japan who could contribute to these projects. These fields of Research and Development in the Human and Social Sciences are clearly overlapping. They are nodes in an overall network of themes. This is a situation typical not only of “soft” sciences but of all scientific and technological research.

Because the goal of this proposal is to be appropriated and rewritten, these fields of R&D will be reworked and specified in concrete projects, which could be financed by answering calls from Brussels and Japanese agencies.

Five themes:

- Designing R&D Policies
- What is Knowledge Society?
- Social and Human Sciences for a Knowledge Society
- Science and Technology policies at the age of globalization
- Construction of large-scale data basis

a. Designing R&D Policies

- Methodologies to design, negotiate and implement Research policies (for instance the Japanese *Comprehensive Analysis of Science and Technology Benchmarking and Foresight* (See NISTEP Reports) should be compared with the EU methodology.
- Research Policy Governance: managing competition and collaboration. Methods for the Management of Science and Technology (MOT).
- Identification and debate between the various models and schools of Science and Technology Management.
- Democracy in a Knowledge Society. Methods to associate and involve the population in the design and assessment of research policies. Conception and role of the “civil society”.
- Evaluation methods according to their context. Strategy of their implementation in Japan and in the EU.
- Constructing post-National R&D policies.

b. What is Knowledge Society?

- From “Information Society” to “Knowledge Society”.
- Knowledge Society: reality, program, ideology or utopia?
- The comparative emergence of various types of Knowledge Society: different conceptions, various trajectories, and diverging policies.
- The politics of science and technology, of Research policies, regarding national sovereignty and political independence. The role of science and technology in the formation of the Nation-State.
- The institutional environment of science and technology: a comparative approach. Comparing forms of collaboration between the private and public sectors, between universities, government firms and the general public.
- Institutional environment: Intellectual and Industrial Property Rights, the role of the legal structure.
- The image of science and technology in emerging Knowledge Societies. Prevalent attitudes in the EU and Japan, their impact on education, research and

business creation. Evaluation of the various institutions and programs to study and modify these representations (science museums, science centres, etc).

c. Social and Human Sciences for a Knowledge Society

- The conception, role and structure of the Social Sciences and the Humanities in European Nations and in Japan.
- The comparative formation of scientific objects (nature, life, society, man, the environment) according to different cultural and social contexts.
- Comparative study of the emergence of new fields of research and disciplines, of their institutionalization and of their resulting capacity to contribute to policy making.
- The relevance of Ethics for a Knowledge Society. Ethics and its relations to Social and Human Sciences. Case studies:
 - i. Nanotechnology
 - ii. Stem cell research
 - iii. “Bio-Info-Nano” convergence
- Economics in context: the role, status and structure of Economic disciplines amongst the Social and Human Sciences according to different countries and their respective histories.
- The interaction of Science and Technology Studies with the life and organization of laboratories, universities. How can they contribute to institutional reform and policy making?

d. Science and Technology Policies at the age of globalization

- Research policies and international relations: globalization and the search for comparative advantage.
- Outsourcing and delocalization of Research and Development activities.
- Post-national Research policies and emerging forms of regional or global collaboration.
- North/South collaboration: how to reduce the Science and Technology divide?
- Science and Technology Studies and the “reconstruction” of the *Commons* (Humanity’s “Common Goods”). Open Property Rights (“Knowledge Commons”, etc).

- Technophobia: moral, religious or cultural grounds for the rejection of fields of Research and Development: stem cell research, nanotechnology, GMO, etc.
- e. Construction of large-scale data bases on all these issues in order to facilitate joint research and provide open access to information.

3. Second level: the structure of the Social Sciences and Humanities in the EU 7th Framework Programme

In May 2006, the official outline of the research agenda has defined “seven activities” divided in “areas” detailed in the document *Draft research agenda for Theme 8 “Socio-economic Sciences and the Humanities” in the 7th Community RTD Framework Programme (2007-2013)*.

See: http://ec.europa.eu/research/fp7/home_en.html

- Growth, employment and competitiveness in a knowledge society;
- Combining economic, social and environmental objectives in a European perspective;
- Major trends in society and their implications;
- Europe in the world;
- The citizen in the European Union;
- Socio-economic and scientific indicators;
- Foresight activities.

This list is a reminder that a EU Research Policy does not provide generic support for all research but a targeted support for the joint economic and social development of all EU members. Still EU documents regularly recognize that such a goal can only be achieved by supporting research in its various dimensions. This is why scientific committees generally interpret these lists with open minds. Lists of priorities are like a net for catching fish without really knowing if the most valuable fish will be caught in this net. Themes are knots in the net. The knots in the EU list are quite helpful to structure calls in Europe but they lose pertinence when used to foster collaboration with Japan. Not that the Japanese have other priorities: they have exactly the same, like all other Nations! The problem is that such a list does not provide enough incentive to develop innovative research with Europeans. The

solution I propose is to reduce the number of knots in the net and to reshape the list in order to identify a second level of collaboration, closely related to the common platform.

In order to foster collaboration with Japan, the EU agenda for the Social Sciences and Humanities needs to be reformulated in the three fields (plus one), here presented from the point of view of the emergence of a Knowledge Society and its social as well as economic consequences.

- a. Social and economic issues (Activity 1): “growth, employment and competitiveness”:
 - i. Area 1: “The changing role of knowledge throughout the economy”. “Implications of different types of knowledge for different aspects of the economy”.
 - ii. Area 2: “Structural change in Europe and its relation to growth, competitiveness and employment”. “Globalization and growth”.
- b. Growing constraints on social and economic development (Activity 2, activity 3):
 - i. Global warming; energy shortages; aging of the population and other demographic changes, advance and breakthrough in science and technology, societal changes, growing deficiencies of political systems, rising health cost, religious fundamentalism, new forms of nationalism, increased international insecurity, etc.
 - ii. Soon societies will compete for scarcer resources and these conflicts will further increase constraints and insecurity. The aggregation of these constraints makes the evolution of societies more and more unpredictable and more and more divergent. Violence and wars (Activity 4, area 2) are frequently the outcome of unmanageable complexity. Due to their history and level of scientific and technical development, societies will differ more and more from each other, to the point of losing sight of what they have in common (Activity 3, area 2; activity 5, area 2).

- iii. This situation will become a strong challenge for existing socio-economic models (area 1) as well as a challenge for democratic institutions: a state of conflict and urgency will become recurrent to the point of questioning the efficiency and relevance of democratic institutions.
 - iv. Social and cultural trends in advanced industrial societies. Many trends are increasingly questioning social cohesion (Activity 1, area 2; activity 3): new inequities based on technical competence and training; increasing individualistic attitudes and collective behaviours disconnected from established political values. Both in the EU and Japan, the evolution of society becomes more and more unpredictable from the point of view of common values and shared references (ethics, work, studies, knowledge, etc). Increasing hedonism and growing personal insecurity leading to anomic behaviours. Modern political and social controls become ineffective.
 - v. The paradox of the present: to find solutions or regulations, these constraints require intense and collaborative Research and Development. But many social and cultural trends seem, for the moment, adverse to the formation of a sustainable Knowledge Society. Foresight Activities (activity 7) should concentrate on this paradox, its origin and consequences.
- c. Institutional innovation as a response to growing constraints and insecurity at the local, regional (the EU) and international (global) level (Activity 5: the citizen in the European Union):
- i. “Democratic practices and governance”
 - ii. “A “European public and the media”
 - iii. Social inclusion and cohesion: managing cultural differences, new forms of citizenship.
 - iv. Immigration policies and Human Rights
- d. Establishing reliable and comparative socio-economic and scientific indicators.

Reframed in this perspective, the fields of “activities” identified by the EU for the Social Sciences and the Humanities become fields of common interest and joint research with Japanese specialists in Social and Human Sciences. These fields constitute a second level of potential collaboration, reinforced by a third level coming this time from Japan.

4. Third level: Japan and Europe in search of each other

The last level is the content and organization of research and teaching on Europe and the EU in Japan. The problem is that this level cannot ignore Japanese Studies in Europe and European Studies in Japan. The sole concern of this research report is and remains EU and Japanese Science and Technology policies, the conditions of emergence of a Knowledge Society. Still it is quite impossible to separate the two, in particular to draw a clear distinction between “Europe” and the “EU”. But this problem does not concern Japan only: it is found all over the world, for instance in the US⁵. This confusion explains why Europe and Studies tend all over the world to perform below expectation.

Since the mid-19th century, European and Japanese histories, societies and cultures have been closely intertwined. This study is beyond and outside the scope of the present report. Still this reciprocal fascination and emulation have a strong impact on issues here at stake: strong and influential institutions have been constructed in Japan and in Europe for each society to study the other. Documents and references are available on the web:

- **Japanese Studies in Europe:** <http://www.jsnet.org/>⁶
- **European Studies in Japan:** all information is available at the website of the *Asia-Europe Foundation* situated in Singapore: <http://asef.on2web.com/subSite/ESiA/default.asp>. A list of research centres or institutes can be found in appendices.

⁵ As a former director for France of a European program and Visiting Professor at the University of California at Santa Cruz, I was asked to construct a program in European Studies, different from those offered in other universities. Nobody could agree on what European Studies should or could be.

⁶ A short history of Japanese Studies in Europe is available at:
<http://www.columbia.edu/%7Ehds2/BIB95/contents.htm>

Without any doubt, the quantity and quality of the knowledge produced is quite remarkable. What is surprising is how little it evolves. For instance, at the very moment Japan is launching its 3rd Basic Plan for Science and Technology, the *Japanese Studies Network Forum* (see above) lists from Fall 2005 to December 2006 forty-one major conferences and symposia on Japan. None deals specifically with the 3rd Plan or Japanese research policy; eight concern the Japanese economy (most of them are regular symposia of the *Research Institute of Economy, Trade and Industry* (RIETI), a department of the Ministry for Economy, Trade and Industry, the former MITI). Only five focused on Europe and the EU, organized or co-organized by German institutions. Nothing on issues concerning the emergence of a “Knowledge Society”, questioning the mutation of the role, structure and management of knowledge in advanced industrial societies. “Exchange of ideas”, “knowing each other better” still seem the order of the day. None has the ambition to generate new knowledge, “frontier knowledge” in Human and Social Sciences.

The main institution in Europe studying on a regular basis Japan’s Science and Technology is the *Institute for Japanese-European Technology Studies*, a centre of the famous *Institute for the Study of Science, Technology and Innovation* (ISSTI: www.issti.ed.ac.uk/) at the University of Edinburgh. The work of Martin Fransman belongs to inter-disciplines named Science-Technology-Society and Science and Technology Studies. Research in Japan’s science and technology is available from different sources:

- Japanese Ministries and agencies (for instance the NISTEP. They all have websites in English) and many universities;
- European Research and Cultural institutions:
 - i. Research institutions:
 1. The *Tokyo-Netherlands Institute*,
 2. The *Deutsches Institute für Japanstudien*,
 3. The *Maison franco-japonaise*.
 - ii. “Cultural” institutions promoting European nations abroad (in all Japanese main cities): the Goethe Institut, the Institut franco-japonais, the Alliance française, the Instituto Italiano di Cultur, etc. Science and Technology are generally absent from their activities.
- Most Embassies (Germany, France, the USA⁷, Italy, U.K., etc), including the Delegation of the European Commission to Japan. They are often highly informed and competent on all these topics.

⁷ Reports of the Tokyo Office of the *National Science Foundation* (NSF) are available on the web.

There are good reasons to explain this situation. European societies, cultures and economies, which were competing with each other in Europe, were also competing in Japan: Germany, France, U.K., Holland, Italy (first the Jesuits) and the USA as well. There is no one winner in such a competition: the “foreigners” mainly neutralized each other. For instance, until 1945, German culture was a major influence in Japan. Globally, the Europeans were considered as “the West”, a model of Modernization. They were providing the Japanese with a mirror in which they could learn what is Modern, how to understand and represent themselves according to modern Human and Social Sciences, to rewrite history and describe their society, to imagine what they should become and what they should avoid to become. The Japanese picked and chose: the Army, the Science and the Technology, the Constitution, the economy were first to be German, the Navy and Law were first to be French, the Universities British, etc. After 1945, everything was supposed to become American. In fact, from the beginning, everything remained, “became”, Japanese. All these “influences” and “imitation” could not obliterate the strong and asserted identity of the Japanese institutional system. They reinforced it, they still do.

The competition between European Nations never stopped neither in Japan nor anywhere else. It is quite an important matter for European Nations because Japan is a model for East-Asian Modernization. The former role of Europe for Japan is the role played by Japan in East Asia: a reluctant mirror. The successful formation of the European Union is transforming in Japan the traditional competition between European Nations. It introduces a new level of collaboration and joint research with Japan, which needs to be understood and organized. For these reasons, it is time to sever the ambiguity of European Studies by institutionalizing the distinction between:

- European Studies.

- EU (European Union) Studies.

This distinction should be widely debated. *European Studies* have always been *National Studies*, French, German, English, Italian, etc. What was effectively *European* was never clear (neither in Japan nor in Europe), the result of tentative comparisons, often in search of a common ground, regularly found in Christianity. “European Studies” is a very confusing notion. Furthermore, in the last twenty years, in the USA and in Japan, this notion has been used to reorganize in Universities departments of foreign languages, literature and civilization in order to restructure the Humanities and create a large department of “Area Studies” loosely divided

according to geography. Because geography (“area”) does not mean anything pertinent for literature, art, history or philosophy, this evolution further weakened the Humanities and proved how much the Humanities have been losing ground in favour of the Social Sciences. In fact, Humanities disciplines have been going through a deep mutation blurring the demarcation with Social Sciences. The Humanities largely became *Human Sciences*. What is weakened is this part of the Humanities, which were unable to change or refused to change. As a result, European Studies have been receding in Japan, like they receded in other parts of the world. They are other reasons: Europe seemed weaken and divided, the West seemed dominated by the USA, China was opening, etc. But Europe’s unification is also the world largest market and its institutions are changing the world. The notion of “European Studies”, as it is understood in the US or Japan, is too obscure and ambiguous to express the present European experience.

The notion of “EU Studies” opens new possibilities. At one condition: European Nations should stop competing with each other for prominence. For instance, in many universities in the world, German departments have been losing a lot of students. As an answer to this and with the financial help of German cultural agencies, these departments transformed themselves into Department of German and European Studies. To name just a few universities: Georgetown, UC Berkeley and in Japan, the University of Tokyo. This is a typical case of “negative competition” creating disruptive conflicts and reverse effects on each campus, including at Tokyo University. The transition toward EU Studies is designed not to compete with European Studies, not to weaken them, but to add a new level of research and collaboration.

From this point of view, in Japan, EU Studies should obviously focus on (at least) two fields, plus one, coming from Japan:

- Europe’s unification process:
 - i. Its historical reasons and foundations.
 - ii. Is it a model of reconciliation and progress for East Asia?
 - iii. The co-construction of post-National institutions and their global impact.
 - iv. The construction of EU policies, for instance for Science and Technology.

- The transition toward a *Knowledge Society*
- **Level three: fields of collaboration and shared experience between Japan and the EU.**

Based on an interview with Professor MIYAJIMA Takashi, Hosei University, Tokyo.

Professor Miyajima is well known as the most eminent and competent specialist of Europe and the EU in Japan. As a sociologist and political scientist, he developed a perspective on Europe beyond National and cultural borders, taking into account the conflicting diversity of European Nations, how they finally chose to design a common destiny. Professor Miyajima is the head of an informal community associating the best Japanese researchers in Japan.

In a discussion last March 2006 in Tokyo, Professor Miyajima articulated five themes expressing Japan's present collective experience and questioning. I freely adapt them here to show that they are also questions on Europe and the European Union.

i. Regional integration

1. Is it possible to replicate in East Asia what European nations have achieved? Is there a European Model?
2. What are the steps to undertake in order to evolve from an "East-Asian Community" to an "integration" process? How can nations change the perception they have of each other?
3. Collective memory and the role of intellectuals, the impact of Human and Social Sciences.

ii. East-Asian Knowledge Society: competing for brains

1. The Cold War is finished in Europe, not in Asia.
2. East Asia as a High Tech region: IT penetration and practices according to each East-Asian country.
3. Social Ethics, its impact on the emergence of Knowledge Societies.

iii. Evolution of the conception and role of the family, the transformation of gender relations in Japan and East-Asia

1. The falling birth rate in Japan has deep reasons, which need to be thoroughly investigated and compared with other social, cultural and economic conditions. Comparing gender relations and the status of women.
2. How to sustain economic development and a growing need for competence in a Nation where competition for competence and jobs is decreasing?
3. An East Asia problem: policies to prevent high tech emigration and attract foreign competence. Why immigration cannot be a response for manpower shortage in Japan?
4. Comparing policies to change the role, status and education of women in Japan, in China, Taiwan, Korea and the Philippines.

iv. Trans-national citizenship

1. New conceptions of citizenship at the local, national and regional level.
2. Managing immigration: strong competition for East-Asian Nations to provide forms of citizenship to immigrants and foreigners. Cultural and political reactions.
3. Comparing immigration and citizenship policies.

v. A sociological approach of Economics and Management

1. Are there Economic norms?
2. Economics and its various cultural and social presuppositions. Sustaining the diversity of socio-economic models.

Any fruitful collaboration with Japanese specialists in Human and Social Sciences would have to assimilate this third level and its fields of interest. They richly complement the other two levels. This complexity multiplies opportunities for researchers.

The various questions raised by Professor Miyajima bring something new and important to European Human and Social Sciences, to European societies and also to the EU. This advancement of knowledge by associating problems and issues from other parts of the world is a lesson in methodology. Mr. Miyajima could not have articulated these questions without his thorough knowledge and understanding of European societies. In return, his questioning of Japan and other East-Asian countries introduce a different perspective on Europe's unification, on problems which have been solved and also on other problems which have not been raised and might therefore come back or come in the foreground in the future. Europeans should learn to articulate new problems by studying East-Asian Societies. Some of these problems (for instance immigration) might be among those, which are for the moment hindering Europe's unification process.

5. Institutional innovation for joint Research in Social and Human Sciences

Learning from East Asia by learning on the EU and learning from the EU in order to learn on East Asia: this is key to produce new knowledge. New knowledge in the Human and Social Sciences is a major component in the emergence of different types of Knowledge Society. Various types of Knowledge Society are already today competing with each other. This is implicitly at stake in Japanese and European Research Policies. This proves that Knowledge Societies are not Science and Technology Societies: they are not a sort of new positivistic nightmare based on advanced market economy.

Such a progress in knowledge requires institutional innovation to organize this research and produce this knowledge. The following proposals are simple and pragmatic. They only concern problems Science and Technologies policies and their related social, economic and cultural issues characteristic of a "Knowledge Society". There are many institutions for cooperation between European Nations and Japan: they compete more than cooperate. My concern is to add a new field of collaboration with Japan, at the level of the EU.

- From bridge to networks

Still, in Europe and in Japan, between Europe and Japan, networks between existing institutions are badly needed to organize and stimulate collaboration between the EU and Japan, to prove Europeans and Japanese that they can produce knowledge without the mediation of the

US. The question is not to exclude the USA, US universities, for whatever reasons. It would not make sense; it would be counter productive.

The problem is two fold:

- i. To foster and sustain a diversity of research in Science and Technology. As explained before, this diversity comes from the institutional environment, so diverse in Europe and also different in Japan. They are many ways of doing science, of developing technology, of creating new products for various markets. This diversity is necessary for the long-term advancement of science and technology in the world. North and South Americans, Asian, Russian or African specialists can be associated within the framework of the project.
- ii. To generate new knowledge. To achieve this goal is not a question of individual or national genius, not even of training and financing. It is mainly a two-fold question:
 1. Matching schools of thought, of experience, problems and issues. The above discussion with Professor Miyajima is a good example.
 2. Creating proper structures: networks between existing institutions.

- From networks to platforms

These networks between Europeans and Japanese should be dedicated to the selection of themes of joint research, to create a project, to write grants and/or raise funds, to realize the project and disseminate the results.

These networks should function as web-based platforms for Research and Collaboration between members from different institutions and disciplines associated in the design and achievement of a project.

This is the reason why this report takes so much care in identifying potential themes of joint research based on such platform in order to facilitate the formation of these networks.

- Types of platform in Europe and Japan

The truth is that, if they exist, the type of networks I propose are difficult to find, even if they are easy to imagine and their potential performance quite obvious.

i. PRIME: example from the 6th EU FPST

The 5 & 6th EU Framework Programme for Science and Technology provided funds to create and establish large trans-national networks to structure a common Research basis within the EU. In the Social Sciences and the Humanities, some large and strong structures have been born, developed by institutions large enough to create and manage heavy structures with large managing costs. The best example is PRIME (*Policies in Research and Innovation in the Move towards the European Research Area*, director Philippe Laredo, Ecole Nationale des Ponts et Chaussées, Paris), a programme in Science and Technology management. PRIME is a remarkable achievement, targeted to respond to the creation of a “European Research base”. It associates mainly economists and engineers developing economic models adjusted to “reality” by sociology. Of course, EU Scientific Committees feel safe when they give public funds to a programme like PRIME. PRIME creates infrastructures of knowledge, its highways, its power plants and its dams.

PRIME is a step in the evolution of EU Research Policies. But the 7th FPST goes a step further. If this ambition is not sheer “public relation”, the 7th EU Programme expresses a different goal. It is this new ambition that I articulate in relation to Japan’s 3rd Plan because it expresses a very similar ambition, a similar diagnosis of the present conjuncture. The Japanese first two Basic Plans were also targeting infrastructure and they did not generate new knowledge. Now the constraints are so strong, insecurities and uncertainties so high, that we, Europeans and Japanese, are forced to innovate.

PRIME is a good example. It does not ignore the evolution and diversity of Human and Social Sciences; it does not take them into account. Based on existing relations between its creators, it spreads and extends existing knowledge within the EU, provide employment to young researchers, produce reports and teaching, etc. But PRIME does not produce new knowledge. Its strength even has counter-effects: all new projects in Science and Technology Studies in France and elsewhere will in the end have to become part of PRIME if they hope to be recognized and financed. This creates a situation where it is much easier for European researchers in advanced Human and Social Sciences to develop their work in the US and

Japan⁸! PRIME managers have certainly no will or design to marginalize Human and Social Sciences outside Economics: they just ignore them.

PRIME is not any more a network. It has become a sort of “European Institute in Science and Technology Management”. It builds and reinforces its own identity. At this level of institutionalization, PRIME “exchanges”, “circulates” researchers, students, projects, etc. When PRIME arrives in Japan (it will happen sooner or later), it will face two schools of Management of Technology.

One is under construction at the RCAST (*Research Centre of Advanced Science and Technology*) at the University of Tokyo. PRIME will quickly develop strong relations with this project because both have the same source: the British school of Science and Technology management.

The other school is based at the *Tokyo Institute of Technology*: the programme (it is about ten years old) there, beyond or below international collaboration, is to create a Japanese alternative to the British (now European) and American models to reform, develop and manage Japanese “research bases”. It now aggregates a wide array of research on knowledge production and distribution extending far beyond Economics. It also attracts students, trains them, finances their thesis and helps them find jobs. These students mainly come from Japan, but also from China, Korea, Taiwan, Russia, etc. This program (a “Centre Of Excellence”) has a branch in Austria.

I chose to develop with some length this example because PRIME managers would probably take this analysis as “negative” criticism. I simply want to show what a different or new approach in Social and Human Sciences can bring to the design and implementation of Research policies.

ii. Flexible networks

I propose the creation of light and flexible networks, dedicated to innovative projects associating EU and Japanese specialists in Human and Social Sciences, open to other specialists from different nations and background. They are quite different from professional organizations specialized in Asia but work with their members.

European “Institutes for Advanced Studies” could or should *harbour* such networks. There are two examples in France.

⁸ See for instance my website, a typical case.

- The *Réseau Asie*. Director: Jean-François Sabouret

This recent structure offers to French speaking Asia specialists the possibility to meet every two years and present their research to each other. For three days in Paris, the participants have the opportunity to have an overview of their domain. They understand how to position their work, the trends of their domain, evaluate what is missing and how they could contribute to its progress. Herewith they become a community. It does not reduce rivalries but competition becomes positive.

J.F. Sabouret is a specialist of education and minorities in Japan. Japan is not the core of the *Réseau Asie*. He is presently extending the network to South European Universities.

This network has full institutional recognition by the French CNRS, but, because of its flexibility, it is constantly struggling for adequate financing. The *Réseau Asie* is typically a structure, which could propose remarkable projects to the 7th Framework Programme.

- *Knowledge Society Network*. Director: Alain-Marc Rieu

This platform is designed for joint innovative projects in Human and Social Sciences between Europe, Japan and California on all issues related to the emergence of various forms of “Knowledge Society”. It develops a comparative analysis of Research policies in their institutional systems, including university reforms. It presently studies the various discourses, theories and policies concerning the Bio-Info-Nano “convergence”.

Grounded on an international scientific committee, this Network associates a research centre in the San Francisco Bay Area and another at the Tokyo Institute of Technology.

It is located in Lyon, France, at the *Institute of East-Asian Studies* (CNRS) at the new *Ecole Normale Supérieure* fully dedicated to Human Sciences. It participates in the development of the *Région Rhône-Alpes* Research policy.

The present report typically expresses the perspective of its founder.

iii. Networks in Japan dedicated to EU Studies (see appendix 2):

- The European Union Studies Association-Japan (EUSA-Japan)
 - i. Doshisha University
 - ii. Keio University
- EU Institute in Japan-Tokyo Consortium (EUIJ) associating:

- i. “Academic centre of studies and research on the European Union in Japan. It is sponsored by the European Commission and managed by a consortium of four Tokyo universities”.
- ii. The two EU Institutes in Japan are located at Kobe University and Hitotsubashi University.
- iii. The Tokyo University branch on Komaba campus is located within the German department.

The goal of these two distinct structures is to focus, organize and promote studies on the European Union. It is not a network designed to produce new knowledge.

Conclusion

- The convergence of Japan's and the EU's R&D policies

Japan's 3rd Basic Plan and the EU's 7th Framework programme for Science and Technology are launched at a few months interval, in 2006 and 2007. This coincidence is also a remarkable convergence. It opens an opportunity to perform a quantum leap in collaboration between Japanese and European R&D communities.

Both plans are based on a deep introspection of the societies concerned, on their understanding of their past and the present world. They express a vision of the future. Both are highly complex architectures based on a wide debate and investigation. Both are designed to change the life of people and our societies. Both will also have a major impact on the world evolution. When European nations and Japan decide their future, these nations also shape the future of others, including the United States of America. No research policy is an island. These policies respond to other policies. They make choices, which influence and impact upon others. They are far more intertwined than they want to admit.

The Nations having the capacity to design, finance and implement such policies will very soon have to face the consequences and impact of their choices: already they need to include these consequences in the very design of their policies. For many reasons detailed in this report, Europe and Japan should invent a new range of collaboration, not only to study each other as we have been doing since the late 19th century, not only to invite each other to participate to each other's programs, but to jointly produce frontier knowledge on these policies, on the world they change and also create.

- Emerging Knowledge Societies

At this moment of convergence of their research policies, Europeans and Japanese need to debate their conception of the present and their vision of the future, i.e. to analyze together the presuppositions, conditions and consequences of such policies. They need to clarify and debate this historical mutation of the function, status and organization of knowledge indicating the emergence of various forms of "Knowledge Societies". Many people and nations in this

world are fighting for survival and recognition, for borders and independence as well as established or lost hegemony. Because of their histories, Europe and Japan are reaching beyond these goals. They open a new page of the world history, the transition toward a Knowledge Society. They are designing a future based on advance Research and Development on all aspects of society, human life, the environment and collective security. One would need to be blind not to see that increased collaboration is the only way to operate such a mutation and achieve these goals.

- A new role for Human and Social Sciences

Therefore, what Japan's 3rd Basic Plan and the EU's 7th Framework programme have in common extends far beyond a list of scientific and technological priorities. The problems and issues, which are their common concern, are those investigated by Human and Social Sciences. This explains why these disciplines acquire an increased role in both programmes. This proves a maturing of these policies: they acknowledge at last that they intend to reshape societies, the way we all live, work and communicate. It also proves that Human and Social Sciences have a major role to play in the design and implementation of such policies. In return, these disciplines have the responsibility to innovate in order to fulfil such a critical role. The report explains how Japanese and European specialists can contribute.

- A different perspective on the EU and Japan

We need to change the present perception of both Japan and Europe. These new research policies open a different perspective on these nations. We are told that Japan is just recovering from a long crisis. This crisis was so deep that it opened a transition toward a new social and economic system based on a reorganization of all Research and Development activities. The three Basic Plans for Science and Technology are the engines of this transition. Japan is not simply recovering; it slowly reinvents itself. Similarly, in the eyes of many, the European Union is stalled in a deep political crisis and social malaise. But the Union is also able to construct a Science and Technology Policy having the potential to create the basis of new wave of social and economic development. Europe's true dynamics today is best expressed in the coming 7th Framework programme. It is still difficult for many people to understand the evolution of societies from the perspective of research and innovation. Established visions of Japan and Europe hide the hope and power expressed in the design of such policies. To collaborate will make them stronger yet.

- A proposal for increased collaboration in Human and Social Sciences between the two programmes

Finally, there is a sense of opportunity and urgency in this report. There is a high probability that the opportunity of this convergence will be lost. They are both at their initial state and initial conditions are always decisive. This explains why the first appendix makes a potentially efficient and fruitful proposal, easy to put in place and with limited cost. The proposal is to create a EU-Japan programme in advanced research in Social and Human Sciences based on a system of residential scholarships.

Appendices

Appendix n° 1

Two proposals for joint-research in Human and Social Sciences between the EU 7th Framework Programme and Japan's 3rd Basic Plan

- **EU-Japan programme in advanced Research in Human and Social Sciences**
 - The program should promote and foster the formation and development of joint networks and platforms for innovative research.
 - The program should be managed in Japan by the Science and Technology Section at the Delegation of the European Commission to Japan in association with the existing European research centres: the *Tokyo-Netherlands Institute*, the *Deutsches Institut für Japanstudien*, the *Maison franco-japonaise*.
 - The program should manage the following scholarship program.
- **EU-Japan residential scholarships** (adapted from the scholarship program of the *Deutsches Institut für Japanstudien*):

A special EU-Japan programme in Human and Social Sciences could offer a number of “residential scholarships” both in Japan and in Europe to doctoral and post-doctoral students, to professionals, researchers and professors throughout their careers, “ranging in duration from three to twelve months”.

A scientific committee expressing all aspects of research in Human and Social Sciences should manage the programme. Recipients would be accepted according to the achievement of a given project. The duration of the scholarship would be adapted to the project.

Recipients should belong to or be associated with a Research and Teaching network or institution (universities, foundations, think tanks, etc). According to their institution of origin, recipients would select a partner institution in Japan or Europe. They would have an office in this institution, to meet and work with other researchers. In association with their Japanese

partner, the Delegation of the European Commission to Japan and the structure selected in the EU to manage the program and receive Japanese recipients, should organize a daily meeting between all recipients so that they meet, express and share their research.

Part of the responsibility of the recipients would be to develop interactions between their institutions in the EU or Japan. During the length of their scholarship, recipients should produce a document of high standard (article, report, interactive website, etc) on subjects in the general field of Human and Social Sciences in the EU and Japan.

Each year in autumn a call for applications would be posted on EU and Japanese websites providing further details. Grants would usually start according to the requirements of the institutions the recipient is coming from. Individual arrangements are possible

Appendix n° 2

EU and European Studies in Japan

July 2006

The following list only mentions programs concerned with EU studies as such. These programs and institutions complement the list of departments and programs in all major Japanese universities concerned with European national cultures and societies. The study of the various European national cultures always includes references to European civilization. But Europe's unification process introduces a new level of inquiry and research. The two levels enrich each other.

1. European Union Studies Association-Japan (EUSA-Japan)

Address

c/o Prof. Yoshikatsu Washie

Faculty of Law

Doshisha University

Karasuma-Higashi-iru, Imadegawa-dori, Kamigyo-ku, Kyoto, 602-8580, Japan

Tel: +81-75-251-3620

Fax: +81-75-251-3620

Website wwwsoc.nii.ac.jp/eusa-japan/index-e.html

Contact Professor: Yoshikatsu WASHIE

Email ywashie@mail.doshisha.ac.jp

2. European Union Studies Association (EUSA)-Asia-Pacific

Address

EU Studies Association-Asia Pacific

Keio University

2-15-45 Mita, Minato-ku, Tokyo, Japan 108-8345

Contact President: Prof. Toshiro Tanaka

Email tanatosi@law.keio.ac.jp

3. Nanzan University, Centre for European Studies (CFES)

Address

18 Yamazoto-Cho, Showa-ku, Nagoya-Shi, Japan

Tel.: +81 52 8323111

Fax: +81 52 8312741

Website www.ic.nanzan-u.ac.jp

Contact Director: Prof. Toshiaki Tomooka

Email cfes@ic.nanzan-u.ac.jp

4. EU Institute in Japan (EUIJ)

Address

Frontier Kan 6F,
Kobe University
Rokkodai Campus 2-1, Rokkodai, Nada-ku, Kobe 657-8501
Tel : +81 78 8037221
Fax : +81 78 8037223
Website euij-kansai.jp
Focus Issues on EU
Contact

President: KUBO Hiromasa
Director: YAMADA Akinori
Email euij@kobe-u.ac.jp

5. EU Institute in Japan-Tokyo Consortium (EUIJ)

Address
EU Institute in Japan
Hitotsubashi University
Mercury Tower 3504
2-1 Naka
186-8601 Kunitachi
Tel : +81 42-580-9117
Fax : +81 42-580-9109
Website <http://euij-tc.org/index.html>
Focus Academic centre of studies and research on the European Union in Japan. It is sponsored by the European Commission and managed by a consortium of four Tokyo universities
Contact
Director General : Prof. Takayuki KIMURA

Branch at the University of Tokyo, Komaba Campus. Director : Professor Kawakita Atsuko

6. Center for New European Research

Address
Centre for New European Research
Graduate School of Law
Hitotsubashi University
2-1 Naka, Kunitachi
Tokyo, Japan
186-8601
Tel: +81 42 5809107 +81 42 5808200
Fax: +81 42 5809107 +81 42 5808201
Website cner.law.hit-u.ac.jp/
Focus Research on Europe in the fields of law, international relations, sociology, economics, regional studies and cultural anthropology.
Email europe-coe-sg@law.hit-u.ac.jp

7. EU-Japan Fest Japan Committee

Address
3F-2-6-10 Kojimachi, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 102-0083 Japan
Tel: +81 3 32885516

Fax: +81 3 32881775

Website www.eu-japanfest.org

Focus European contemporary culture; “Japanese Eyes on Europe/ Europe Today”

Contact Secretary General : Shuji KOGI

Email eu-japan@nifty.com

8. Notre Dame University Kyoto, Department of Cross-Cultural Studies, Center for International Programs

Address

1 Minami-Nonogamicho, Shimogamo, Sakyo-ku, Kyoto 606-0847, Japan

Tel.: (81) 75-7063746

Fax: (81) 75-7063749

Website www.notredame.ac.jp

Email International@notredame.ac.jp

9. Sophia University, Graduate Program in Comparative Culture, International Relations, Courses on Europe

Address

Graduate Program in Comparative Culture

Sophia University

4 Yonban-cho

Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 102-0081 JAPAN

Tel: 81 3-3238-3517

Fax: 81 3-3238-3264

Website www.sophia.ac.jp

Contact

Chancellor: Toshiaki Koso

President: William Currie

Email kcleary@gol.com

10. Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, Graduate School of Area and Culture Studies, Division of Language and Information Studies, European and American Studies

Address

Graduate School of Area and Culture Studies

Address: 3-11-1, Asahi-cho, Fuchu-shi, Tokyo, 183-8534, JAPAN

Telephone: 81 42-3305169

Website www.tufs.ac.jp

Contact Dean of the Faculty of Foreign Studies: Akira Baba

Email kyoumu-daigakuin@tufs.ac.jp

11. Toyama University, Faculty of Humanities, Language and Cultural Studies: European Language and Culture

Address

3190 Gofuku Toyama-city Toyama 930-8555 Japan

Tel: 81 76-4456011

Website www.toyama-u.ac.jp

Contact President: Hiroshi Takizawa

Email info@toyama-u.ac.jp

12. Waseda University, Graduate School of Letters, Arts and Sciences, Majors of English, French, German, Literature, Art, and History.

Address

1-24-1 Toyama, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 162-8644

Tel: 81 3 3203 4381

Fax: 81 3 5286 3536

Website www.littera.waseda.ac.jp

Focus European contemporary culture; “Japanese Eyes on Europe/ Europe Today”

Contact

President: Chung, Seok-Jong

Email tower@list.waseda.jp

Appendix n° 3

Alain-Marc RIEU

<http://w3.ens-lsh.fr/amrieu/>

Former student at the Ecole Normale Supérieure

Agrégé de philosophie

Docteur d'Etat ès Lettres et Sciences Humaines, University of Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne

Former Research Fellow at the Maison franco-japonaise, Tokyo

Positions

- Professor, Department of Philosophy, University Jean Moulin (Lyon 3), France.
- Senior Research Fellow, Institute of East-Asian Studies (CNRS UMR 5062), ENS-lsh
- Various Visiting Professorships in the US and Japan

Professional Address

Institut d'Asie Orientale,
ENS-lsh
15 parvis Descartes
BP 7000
69342 Lyon Cedex 07, France

amrieu@gmail.com

Fields of Research

- Epistemology of Human and Social Sciences. Science & Technology Studies.
- Comparing research policies in Japan, the US and Europe. The organization and status of Knowledge in advanced industrial societies.

Major Publications

- *La techno-science en question*, Seyssel, Editions Champ Vallon, 1990 (with Frank Tinland & Ph. Breton).
- A-M Rieu, K. Wilson, J. van Der Dussen, H.P. Baumeister (ed.), *What is Europe ?*, 4 volumes, 1 000 p. 1st edition, London, Open University Press, 1993 ; 2^o édition, London, Routledge, 1995.
- AM Rieu & G.Duprat (ed.), *European Democratic Culture*, Londres, Routledge, 1995, 261 p.
- *Savoir et pouvoir dans la modernisation du Japon*, Paris, P.U.F., 2001, 336 p.
- A-M Rieu (ed.), *Le concept de décollage : réception, appropriation et légitimation des savoirs étrangers au Japon*, Revue *Daruma*, automne 2001-printemps 2002, 200 p.

Articles since 2002

- "La mutation du régime de la connaissance: le Japon et la sortie du post-moderne", Henri Meschonnic & Hasumi Shigehiko (ed.), *La modernité après le post-moderne*, Paris, Ed. Mameo & Larose, 2002, p 87-97.
- "Knowledge Society and the problem of a global public sphere" in Jean-Christophe Merle (éd.), *Globale Gerechtigkeit. Global Justice*, Stuttgart-Bad-Cannstatt, Frommann-Holzboog (Collection "Problemata") 2005, pp.449-459.
- "The epistemological and philosophical situation of Mind Techno-Science", dans Stefano Franchi and Güven Güzeldere (ed.), *Mechanical Bodies, Computational Minds. Artificial Intelligence from Automata to Cyborgs*, Cambridge, M.I.T. Press 2005, p 453-470.
- "What is Knowledge Society ?", *STS Nexus*, Santa Clara University, Center for Science, Technology and Society, San Jose (CA), September 2005.
- "Research and Education at the age of large-scale data bases", Fukuta Azio (ed.), *What are nonwritten cultural materials?*, Kanagawa University COE Program, 2006, p 167-171.

Lectures since 2005

- "La propriété industrielle d'un point de vue philosophique et épistémologique", Ecole Normale Supérieure-Lettres et sciences humaines, conférence d'agrégation, , Lyon, 18 mars 2005.
- "Modèles et catégories dans les sciences de l'homme et de la société : qu'enseignent les Etudes japonaises ?", Université Jean Moulin, Centre Lyonnais d'Etude sur la Sécurité Internationale et la Défense (CLESID), Lyon, 2 avril 2005.
- "Knowledge today", Santa Clara University, Center for Science, Technology and Society, San Jose (CA), 21 avril 2005.
- "La catégorie du moderne", Université de Naples, Institut « L'Orientale », 18 mai 2005.
- "Divergent trajectories: Japan and US Knowledge Societies : a case for Europe", colloque *The role of Institutional Systems in characterizing Technology Development Trajectories*, International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), Laxenburg, Austria, 19 septembre 2005.
- "The comparative evolution of Science and Technology Policies in Japan and the USA since 1980", Tokyo Institute of Technology, October 31st, 2005.
- "Research & Education in the age of large-scale databases", Symposium *Systematization of non-written Materials for the study of Human Societies*, Kanagawa University, Yokohama, November 27th, 2005.
- "The European Union and the limits of Modern Political Theory", Department of Advanced Social and International Studies & Institute for German and European Studies, Tokyo University, February 2nd, 2006.
- "Globalisation et politiques de recherche: le cas du Japon et des États-Unis depuis les années 1980», Tokyo, Maison franco-japonaise, February 23rd, 2006.
- "Emerging Knowledge Societies: comparing reforms of research in Japan and France", Symposium *Elucidation of Co-evolutionary dynamism between innovation and institutional systems*, Tokyo, Tokyo Institute of Technology, February 27th, 2006.
- "Planting forests or growing flowers: research policies and politics", *Research Policy Analysis Seminar*, Tokyo, Tokyo Institute of Technology, October 31st, 2006.